

REMARKS

Amendments to the Specification

Applicants have amended page 14 of the Specification as recommended by the Examiner.

Amendments to the Claims

Claims 17-27 have been canceled.

Claims 28, 30, 31, and 33 have been amended to replace the term “can be.” Support for this amendment is found in the Specification at page 27, lines 15-21, and in general grammar.

Claim 28 has been amended to replace the “characterized” language with “comprising.” Claim 28 has further been amended to add the language “adjacent rolls if two or rolls are provided” “with adjacent rolls if two or more of the rolls are provided.” Support for this amendment is found in Claim 28 as originally presented, lines 3 and 12.

Claims 30 and 33 have been amended to replace “competed” with “completed.”

Objections to the Specification

The Examiner objects to the recitation “polyethylenenaphthalate” on page 14, line 9. Applicants have amended the Specification to add a space between polyethylene and naphthalate. Applicants submit that this amendment obviates the rejection and request that it be withdrawn.

Claim Objections

The Examiner objects to claims 28, 30, and 31 for the recitation of “can be.” Applicants have amended the claims to recite “is optionally.” Applicants submit that this amendment obviates the objection and request the objection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under §102

The Examiner rejects claims 23, 24, 26-29, 31, 32, and 34 as anticipated by Hirose et al. (U.S. Patent 4,955,471)(hereinafter Hirose). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Applicants point out that claims 17-27 have been canceled, thus rendering the rejection moot as to those claims.

With regard to claims 28, 29, 31 and 32, Applicants respectfully submit that Hirose does not anticipate the present invention for the following reason. The Examiner states that Hirose teaches an electrode material package, comprising: a support shaft for supporting one or more rolls, each of which comprises a hollow cylindrical core, a base plate which extends from the support shaft to the extent larger than a radius of the roll, an end plate which extends from the support shaft to the extent larger than the radius of the roll, a cushion material, the thickness of the cushion materials in the longitudinal direction of the support shaft being selected, so that at least one space is optionally formed, between the core of the roll and the base plate, between the core of the roll and the end plate, and between the cores of the adjacent rolls if two or more of the rolls are provided.

Applicants submit that the reference has not met every element of the claims. Specifically, Hirose does not disclose that the cushion material is selected so that *at least one space is formed*. (See Specification Fig. 10, element 150; discussed in the Specification at pages 35 line 13 to page 36 line 12, emphasis added). In contrast, Hirose explicitly discloses that the “plurality of pancakes 2 are disposed vertically and form an array of pancakes 10 *as the end faces 4a of the hubs 4 are adjacent with each other . . .*” (Hirose col. 3, lines 33-34, discussing Figure 1(a),

emphasis added). Thus, Hirose clearly does not anticipate every element of the claims, since the spaces between the core of the roll and the end plate, and between the cores of the adjacent rolls are not disclosed. Since claims 29, 31 and 32 depend from claim 28, they also include element 150. Thus, Hirose does not anticipate those claims either. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

Claim Rejections Under §103

Applicants first point out that claims 17-27 have been cancelled.

The Examiner rejects claims 30 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Hirose in view of Posso (U.S. Patent 4,762,223)(hereinafter Posso). Applicants respectfully traverse.

The Examiner states that Hirose “teaches all the limitations of claim 29,” and that Posso teaches the additional limitation that the connection ring is provided with a lever member thus the combination teaches all the limitations of claim 30. Applicants disagree. As discussed above, Hirose does not teach that the cushion material is selected so that *at least one space is formed*. Posso does not remedy this deficiency. Thus Applicants submit that the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

Similarly, claim 32 is not rendered obvious by the combination of Hirose and Posso. Therefore, Applicants submit that the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness for claim 32. Applicants request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

CONCLUSION

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Mark J. Nuell Reg. No. 36,623 at the telephone

Application No. 10/574,008
Amendment dated July 14, 2008
Reply to Office Action of February 14, 2008


Docket No.: 0020-5477PUS1

number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: July 14, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Mark J. Nuell

Registration No.: 36,623
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
12770 High Bluff Drive
Suite 260
San Diego, California 92130
(858) 792-8855
Attorney for Applicant